

Illinois State University

## ISU ReD: Research and eData

---

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

---

Spring 5-7-1980

### Senate Meeting May 7, 1980

Academic Senate  
*Illinois State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting May 7, 1980" (1980). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 389.  
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/389>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact [ISUReD@ilstu.edu](mailto:ISUReD@ilstu.edu).

May 7, 1980

Volume XI, No. 16

Contents

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of April 16, 1980

\*Chairperson's Remarks

Vice-Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Resignation of Senator and Seating of Replacement

Administrators' Remarks

Academic Freedom Committee Election

Ethics & Grievance Committee Election

External Committee Appointments

Committee Reports

Communications

Adjournment

\*Faculty Senators Meeting

\*appendices

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University Community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate.

Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES  
(not approved by the Academic Senate)

May 7, 1980

Volume XI, No. 16

Call to Order

The meeting of the Academic Senate was called to order by Chairperson Cohen at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call

The roll was called by Secretary Kohn and a quorum was declared present.

Approval of Minutes of April 16, 1980

XI,118 On a motion by Schmalz/Grever, the minutes of April 16 were approved by voice vote with the following corrections: Mr. Kohn noted typing errors on page 2 and 3 (4th line under Student Body President's Remarks, "said"; middle of page 3, "students") and asked that "students" be inserted after "...petitions on which 675..." Mr. Boaz noted that he is chairperson of the Faculty Affairs Committee, not Mr. Madore.

Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Cohen yielded the floor to Mr. Hirt who read a memorial statement for Weldon J. Bailey. (Statement attached as appendix to these minutes.) Mr. Cohen requested a moment of silence in memory of Mr. Bailey. Mr. Cohen then reminded senators to turn in summer address sheets. Internal committee minutes needed to be turned in to the Senate office. June 25 was the date of the next Senate meeting. Student senators should report new fall addresses to the Senate office as soon as possible.

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Mr. Barton reported that students were the winners of the student/administration baseball game held recently.

Student Body President's Remarks

Mr. Henriksen reported that the Student Association office would be open this summer with many services available.

Resignation of Senator and Seating of Replacement

XI,119 Mr. Cohen announced the resignation of Kevin Filer. On a motion by Henriksen/Barton, the resignation was accepted, with regret, on a voice vote. Mr. Cohen invited David Sam to take his seat as new student senator.

Administrators' Remarks

President Watkins noted the death of George Odum, Superintendent of Buildings, a well-liked and faithful worker. Mr. Watkins requested that the chair ask for a moment of silence in memory of Mr. Odum and that words of sympathy be expressed

to Mrs. Odum. A moment of silence was requested by the chair.

Mr. Watkins requested an executive session at 7:08 p.m.

The Academic Senate resumed its open session at 7:15 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS:

Academic Freedom Committee Election

On five (5) ballots, the following faculty were elected to three-year terms:

John Crew, Physics  
Scott Eatherly, English  
Frederick Fuess, Agriculture  
Doris Henderson, Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance  
Ralph Lane, Theatre  
Arthur Lewis, Music  
David Ramsey, Economics  
Gordon Redding, Psychology

The following were elected to two-year terms:

Leonard Brubaker, Curriculum & Instruction  
Raphael Haller, Speech Pathology & Audiology

Ethics & Grievance Committee Election

On four (4) ballots, the following faculty were elected to three-year terms:

Robin Carr, English  
George Cunningham, History  
Dean Hiebert, Economics  
Samuel Hutter, Psychology  
Ann Stemm, Home Economics  
Beverly Wilson, Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance

Senate External Committee Appointments

Mr. Young presented the Report of Recommendations for Faculty Appointments to External Committees, dated April 25, 1980, and moved its approval. This was seconded by Ms. Ritch and approved on a voice vote.

XI,120

Academic Planning

Mike Lorber (Education) - 1981  
Jean Grever (Business) - 1983  
Heinz Russelmann (CAST) - 1983  
Lucia Getsi (Arts and Sciences) - 1983

Curriculum Committee

James McQuiston (Fine Arts) - 1982  
Walter Bock (Fine Arts) - 1983  
Betty Keough (CAST) - 1983  
Fred Roberts (Arts and Sciences) - 1983  
Frank Lewis (Education) - 1983

Honors Council

John Chizmar (Arts and Sciences) - 1983  
Robert Preston (Arts and Sciences) - 1983

Academic Standards

Elmer Lemke (Arts and Sciences) - 1982  
William Colvin (Fine Arts) - 1983

University Studies

Jerry Cantlon (Education) - 1983  
John Kirk (Fine Arts) - 1983

Economic Well-Being

Eric Johnson (Arts and Sciences) - 1983  
Carroll Taylor (Business) - 1983

Library Committee

Earl Reitan (Arts and Sciences) 1983  
Herold Stern (Education) - 1983

Reinstatement

Ruth Freyburger (Fine Arts) - 1983  
Helen Benjamin (Business) - 1983

Student Code Enforcement & Review Board (Recommended for appointment by President Watkins)

John McCarthy (Education) - 1983

Student Code Enforcement & Review Board Hearing Panel (Recommended for appointment by President Watkins)

Anne Foreman (Arts and Sciences) - 1982  
Gerald Balls (Arts and Sciences) - 1982  
Virginia Hager (Education) - 1982  
Daryl Manring (Fine Arts) - 1981  
Walter Pierce (Education) - 1982  
Joe Honan (Arts and Sciences) - 1982  
Lorraine Parker (Arts and Sciences) - 1981

Facilities Planning

Thomas Malone (Fine Arts) - 1983

University Forum

Robert Duty (Arts and Sciences) - 1983

Union/Auditorium Board

Don LaCasse (Fine Arts) - 1983  
Dwaine Goodwin (CAST) - 1981 (alternate)

Mr. Young presented the Report of Recommendations for Faculty and Student Appointments to External Committees, dated May 5, 1980, and moved its approval. This was seconded by Mr. Hirt and approved on a voice vote.

XI,121

University Studies

Carson Varner (Business) 1983

Facilities Planning

Susan Vance (Business) 1983

Academic Standards

Marguerite Shane (Business) - 1983

Elections

J. Merle Howard (Education) 1983

Athletic Council (Nominees submitted to President Watkins, three times the number needed, for his appointment to three-year terms)

Diane Wormsley (Education) Dale Jackson (Education)  
Joann Rayfield (Arts and Sciences) William Tolone (Arts and Sciences)  
Jo Workman (CAST) Wayne Zook (CAST)

On a motion by Mr. Young (seconded Slotter) the following students were appointed to, or nominated for, external senate committees as reported by the Rules Committee in reports dated May 5 and May 6.

XI,122

Academic Planning

Linda Meredith (Arts and Sciences)  
Bill Weeks (Education)

Honors Council

Kathy Godshall  
Theresa Reilly  
Kay Wahrman  
Lauren Toalson

Academic Standards

Debbie Coloma  
Peter Nissen  
Don Watson  
Peter Brust

Council on University Studies

Phil Jensen

Reinstatement

Jim Banaski

Council for Teacher Education

John Erickson  
Debbie Edwards  
Cheryl Long  
Julie Merdian

University Curriculum Committee

Darla Broberg  
Cathy Crumley  
Steve Straight

Student Code Enforcement and Review Board (nominated by the Senate, appointed by President Watkins)

Tony Horton  
Diane Miller  
Sally Oehl

Athletic Council (Nominees submitted to President Watkins, twice the number needed, for his appointment to one-year terms)

Jeff Brockway	Jeff Hembrough (football)
Denis Perry	Dave Nussbaumer (basketball)
Kelly Holland	Beth Landes (basketball)
Catherine M. Burke	Lynn Adams (volleyball and track)

Committee Reports

Mr. Schmaltz, Academic Affairs Chairperson, announced the committee would meet following the Senate meeting.

Mr. Tuttle, Administrative Affairs Chairperson, announced the committee had met prior to the Senate meeting.

Mr. Hirt, Budget Committee Chairperson, announced the committee would meet following the Senate meeting.

Mr. Young, Rules Committee Chairperson, reported that while the Senate had divested itself of responsibilities for the Parking and Traffic Committee and the Parking Appeals Board, it continued to cooperate with the Office of the Secretary of the University by providing nominations. Brenda Dewees, a student, will be nominated for a one-year term on the Parking and Traffic Committee. Additionally, Debra Gold, Art Department faculty member, will be recommended to President Watkins for appointment to a three-year term on the Parking Appeals Board. The committee needed to work on the problem of filling faculty vacancies as they occurred. Mr. Hirt asked if members could be chosen by Colleges instead of being appointed by the Senate and was informed that some colleges had problems filling slots for the appropriate collegiate distribution on some committees.

Mr. Boaz, Faculty Affairs Chairperson, announced the committee would meet after the Senate meeting.

Ms. Rosebery, Student Affairs Chairperson, wanted to introduce a resolution for Senate approval expressing opposition to State Representative Bradley's House Resolution #694, urging all Illinois state colleges and universities not to enroll Iranian students until American hostages were released. The chair ruled the resolution out of order, based on a prior Senate resolution, Volume III, No. 15, March 1, 1972, (copy attached as appendix to these minutes).

XI,123 Barton/Henriksen moved to appeal the decision of the chair. Mr. Barton argued that the legislature was giving institutions a choice and Illinois State University should take a position. Mr. Henriksen felt it was not a partisan issue but rather

one that affected higher education. Mr. Tuttle asked for further clarification on the ruling by the chair. Mr. Cohen responded that the proposed House Resolution was a direction from the legislature to the Board of Regents, within the political realm (i.e. politics), and support of the proposed resolution would be contrary to existing Senate rules. Mr. Cohen was requested to read the entire resolution passed by the Senate March 1, 1972. Ms. Goodin requested a roll call vote on the motion to appeal the decision of the chair. Mr. Friedberg asked about the status of the Bradley resolution. Mr. Cohen responded that it had passed the House of Representatives. In essence, the House of Representatives was asking the governing boards to make a decision and the Board of Regents had not asked for the Senate's opinion. In response to a question by Ms. Zunker, Mr. Cohen suggested that for such a question to reach the floor the By-Laws would have to be redone. On a roll call vote, the Senate upheld the chair's ruling, 31 to 9.

(XI,123)

Mr. Henriksen reported that the Student Association Assembly did take a position opposing House Resolution #694.

#### Communications

Mr. Madore reported that the Board of Regents' Fringe Benefits Committee would be meeting in Hovey 308, May 10, at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Cohen mentioned that the work of Professor Martin Dubin of Northern Illinois University, on behalf of the Association of State University Governance Boards, had resulted in a Chicago Tribune editorial supporting higher pay for university employees.

Mr. Cohen asked that the Senate recognize the fine work done by Vidette reporter Leigh Behrens in covering Senate meetings. He further announced the summer schedule of Senate meetings (June 25, July 9, and August 6) and reported that a quorum of 26 was needed to conduct business.

#### Adjournment

On a motion by Anderson/Kolb, the meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m., after which immediately followed a meeting of faculty members of the Academic Senate.

For the Academic Senate,

Walter Kohn, Secretary

IC:WK:pch

XI,124





**MEMO** | **ISU** ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Business  
Department of Management and Marketing

MEMO TO: Academic Senate  
FROM: Department of Management & Marketing  
DATE: April 28, 1980  
SUBJECT: Memorial Statement on Dr. Weldon Bailey

The recent tragic death of Dr. Weldon J. Bailey is a significant loss to Illinois State University, to his students, and his colleagues. Weldon Bailey combined an academic background in administration with years of practical experience in industry, and as a result was able to bring his classes ideas that were realistic and relevant. His students knew him as an approachable, concerned person who was truly interested in helping them learn. Fellow faculty members knew him as a competent, innovative, and cooperative colleague. As may often be the case with those who teach part-time for the University, his contributions may not have been adequately recognized, and it is with real regret that we express our full appreciation only now. Our sincere sympathies go to his wife and family.

XC: Geoff Hirt  
Personnel File

*Handwritten signatures:*  
A. J. ...  
Chapman, M. J. ...

Because the purpose of Illinois State University, as is the purpose of all universities, is to produce an enlightened citizenry, capable of making the wise and responsible choices required in a free society;

Because this purpose requires without qualification that the University serve impartially the citizens of all races, creeds, colors, political parties, and other majorities and minorities by educating the young for full and free participation in the economic, social, and political processes provided for in the statutes and in the State and Federal constitutions;

Because the University is obliged without statement of institutional position to operate within the provisions of these statutes, constitutions, and bills of rights at both State and Federal levels;

Because to fail to so operate is to subject the University, its faculty, and its administrators to societal reprimand, to legal restraint or injunction, and to discontinuance of support;

Because the rule of "siding" with none in order to serve all impartially and fully makes the cherished principle of academic freedom a defensible and, indeed, an essential extension of the freedom of speech and press as provided in the First Amendment;

Because the rights of all students, faculty members, and administrators as citizens acting individually or through non-university groups and organizations are guaranteed by the bills of rights and the constitutions of the State and Federal governments; and

Because accepted academic practice does not permit either students or faculty members to use their classes for the teaching or discussion of controversial matter that has no relation to the subject matter of the course,

Be it resolved (1) that no representative faculty member, faculty body, officer, or agent of Illinois State University shall take an institutional position on any partisan issue for the simple reasons that taking such a position reduces the ability of the University to serve impartially all the people of the State of Illinois and produces conditions and results not in agreement with University Policies as stated in Articles II and III of the Illinois State University Constitution; (2) that, in clarification of this policy, the Academic Senate define a "partisan issue" as a subject of political, social, religious, or similar import on which the members of society outside the University are in serious disagreement or polarized and are in the process of resolving the issue through regular democratic channels; and (3) that, in further clarification of this policy, the Academic Senate define "institutional position" as one on which the University as a community of scholars is represented as having reached a decision for the purpose of influencing society in the resolution of the issue that has polarized it.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary K. Huser  
Paul R. Kincaid  
James L. McBee  
Paul I. Murdock  
Robert C. Smith  
Dale B. Vetter

Meeting of Faculty Members of the Academic Senate  
May 7, 1980 8:40 p.m.

There followed immediately an open meeting of the faculty members of the Academic Senate to discuss OPERATION BOOTSTRAP: A PLAN FOR IMPROVING FACULTY SALARIES AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY. Dean Rives, author of the proposal which is attached, participated. He stated that some funds were available over a four-year period to improve faculty salaries. He pointed out that:

1. At the rank of Professor, ISU faculty were \$3,090 below the average salary of this rank at public Category I institutions, a more serious lag than in any other academic rank.
2. At the rank of Associate Professor, ISU faculty were \$770 below the norm for these public universities.
3. At the rank of Assistant professor, the lag was less serious -- \$590 below the norm.
4. At the rank of Instructor, ISU faculty were slightly above the norm.

The University Review Committee had discussed the matter on April 22:

The discussion included the following major points: (1) it is probably desirable to use an "across the board" approach for this purpose; (2) it might be desirable to relate merit evaluations to the distribution; (3) it is desirable to keep the plan as simple as possible; and (4) the amount of money available for distribution to individuals does not justify an elaborate system for identifying those worthy or unworthy of receiving available funds. After the discussion, the URC passed a motion (7-1) indicating that it had reviewed the proposal and recommends it to the faculty members of the Academic Senate.

It is now appropriate for the faculty members of the Senate to meet to discuss the proposal and take such action as the group deems appropriate. What we need is reactions to and suggestions for improvement of the plan prior to its approval by the President and implementation. An objective is obviously to have a plan approved prior to the distribution of any funds.

Following considerable discussion, Walter Kohn moved (seconded Brickell) that the University Review Committee Report be approved. Dean Rives made it clear that department chairpersons were included in the proposal; other administrators with faculty rank were excluded. Because it was a four-year program, faculty members promoted would become eligible for these salary increases in the year the promotion becomes effective, unless the university established a policy in which promotions automatically carry a salary increase.

Strong opposition was expressed by some faculty members. Their objections have since been submitted in writing and are attached.

On a roll call vote the motion passed 18:11 (copy of roll call attached).

IC:WK:pch

MOTION: Approve URC Report

SENATE FACULTY MEETING


MADE BY: Kohn

SECONDED BY: Brickell

RC CALL VOTE OF FACULTY SENATORS PRESENT

NAME	Y	N			Y	N
BELSHE	X			TUTTLE	X	
BOAZ	X			VARNER		X
BOOTHE	X			WELLER		X
BOWEN	X			YOUNG	X	
BRICKELL	X					
BROWN	X					
COHEN	X					
CRAFTS	X					
FISHER	X					
FRIEDBERG		X				
IEDHOFF	X					
GAMSKY	X					
GOWEN		X				
GREVER		X				
HEMENWAY	X					
HIRT		X				
KERN	X					
KOERSELMAN		X				
KOHN	X					
MADORE	X					
MILLER		X				
RITCH		X				
SCHMALTZ		X				
SCHWALM		X				
SHULMAN	X					

TOTAL VOTE: 18:11

MEMO  ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Associate Provost and  
Dean of Undergraduate Instruction

April 22, 1980

TO: Faculty Members, Academic Senate

FROM: Stan Rives *SR*

Attached for your information and review is a plan for improving faculty salaries at Illinois State University. This is to request that the Chairperson of the Academic Senate schedule a meeting of the faculty members of the Academic Senate when it is convenient to do so to discuss this proposal. As you will note from the study, the plan is to be reviewed by the University Review Committee (URC) and then by the faculty members of the Senate prior to approval by the President.

The URC met on April 22 to discuss the proposal. The discussion included the following major points: (1) it is probably desirable to use an "across the board" approach for this purpose; (2) it might be desirable to relate merit evaluations to the distribution; (3) it is desirable to keep the plan as simple as possible; and (4) the amount of money available for distribution to individuals does not justify an elaborate system for identifying those worthy or unworthy of receiving available funds. After the discussion, the URC passed a motion (7-1) indicating that it had reviewed the proposal and recommends it to the faculty members of the Academic Senate.

It is now appropriate for the faculty members of the Senate to meet to discuss the proposal and take such action as the group deems appropriate. What we need is reactions to and suggestions for improvement of the plan prior to its approval by the President and implementation. An objective is obviously to have a specific plan approved prior to the distribution of any funds. I would like to meet with the faculty members of the Senate for this discussion. Also, may I suggest that if any faculty members cannot attend the meeting scheduled to discuss the proposal, that faculty member's reactions and suggestions be communicated to the Chairperson of the Senate prior to the meeting.

Attachment: Plan for Improving Faculty Salaries at ISU

Office of the Provost  
Illinois State University  
Stan Rives  
April 10, 1980

OPERATION BOOTSTRAP: A PLAN FOR  
IMPROVING FACULTY SALARIES  
AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

The Illinois Board of Higher Education has stipulated that general revenue funds presently used to support utilities in bond revenue operations are to be phased out over the next several years. This means that (1) bond revenue operations will pay for utilities out of their income (e.g., residence hall rates will be increased so that utilities used in dormitories will be paid for by dorm residents rather than from general revenue funds), and (2) the recovered general revenue funds will be available for reallocation by the University. President Watkins has proposed and the University Budget Team has agreed that a part of these funds available for reallocation will be utilized to improve faculty salaries. Specifically, \$100,000 a year in 1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85 --a total of \$400,000--will be used for this purpose.

The purpose of this study is to set forth a plan for distribution of the \$400,000. It is proposed that this plan be reviewed by the University Review Committee and by the faculty members of the Academic Senate prior to approval by the President. An objective is to secure reaction to and approval of this plan for improving faculty salaries at ISU prior to any distribution of funds. Further, it is understood that the salary increases proposed in this distribution will be in addition to the usual annual salary increases provided through routine ASPT procedures each year.

Faculty Salaries at Illinois State University

Table 1 compares 1978-79 average faculty salaries by rank in category I public universities with those at Illinois State University. Data are from the latest American Association of University Professors annual salary study, with Category I institutions defined as institutions providing 15 or more earned doctorates in a minimum of three non-related academic disciplines. All AAUP salary data are for the 9-month academic year. These data reveal that:

1. At the rank of Professor, ISU faculty were \$3,090 below the average salary of this rank at public Category I institutions, a more serious lag than in any other academic rank.
2. At the rank of Associate Professor, ISU faculty were \$770 below the norm for these public universities.
3. At the rank of Assistant Professor, the lag was less serious --\$590 below the norm.
4. At the rank of Instructor, ISU faculty were slightly above the norm.

It is perhaps not surprising that ISU faculty salaries are below the norm for this group at the upper three ranks since Illinois State only recently became a Category I institution. What these data do demonstrate is that, from a national perspective, average faculty salaries at the upper three ranks at Illinois State are below the norm for each of these ranks, with the problem being most serious at the full Professor level.

In brief, ISU is competitive at the Instructor rank, less competitive at the Assistant and Associate Professor rank, and least competitive at the rank of Professor.

Table 2--a comparison of 1978-79 average faculty salaries by rank at Category I Illinois public universities with those at ISU--reveals that the same general pattern with ISU salaries \$2,925 below the norm at the Professor rank, \$800 below at the Associate rank, \$550 below at the Assistant rank, and \$150 below the norm at the Instructor rank. This comparison also indicates a consequential lag at the full Professor level and, contrary to the national data, indicates a minor lag at the Instructor level.

Data in Tables 1 and 2 are designed only to illustrate the general nature of problems with faculty salaries at Illinois State University. Table 3 provides data on 1978-79 average faculty salaries by rank at 100 Category I public universities and compares the average at these institutions with average faculty salaries by rank at Illinois State University. Concerning Table 3: (1) each institution included is a public university with doctoral programs; (2) either a sampling of such institutions from large states (e.g., California, New York) or all institutions from smaller states (e.g., Idaho and North Dakota) is included; and (3) average 1978-79 salaries by rank are from the annual AAUP survey--the latest year for which comparative data are available. Since ISU competes for its faculty members in a national market, it was determined that a national study of average faculty salaries was appropriate for purposes of comparison. These data reveal that:

1. At the rank of Professor, the national average of \$27,677 compares with a \$25,100 average at ISU. The average full Professor salary is \$2,577 less than the average for this rank at the 100 institutions studied. Again, the lag is more serious at the full Professor than at any other rank.
2. At the rank of Associate Professor, a national average of \$20,960 compares with a \$20,300 average at ISU. There is a lag of \$660, but it is far less serious than at the Professor rank.
3. At the rank of Assistant Professor, the national average of \$16,966 compares with an ISU average of \$16,500. The \$466 lag at ISU is less serious than at the Associate Professor level and far less serious than at the Professor level.
4. At the rank of Instructor, a national average of \$13,516 compares with a \$13,700 average at ISU. Instructor salaries at ISU, that is, are essentially in a line with those in the comparison group--\$184 above the average at the 100 institutions studied.

If an objective in distributing the \$400,000 available is to bring average faculty salaries by rank more into line with the sampling of salaries at public universities offering doctoral programs, then the available funds would be distributed among Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors. No funds would be distributed to Instructors.

The following illustrates a hypothetical basis for distribution of the \$400,000 were it to have been distributed in 1978-79 to the ISU faculty which existed in 1978-79; it is hypothetical in that the funds obviously were not distributed that year, nor will they be distributed in a single year.

Rank	Number	Deficiency	Total Deficiency	Rank % of Deficiency
Professor	226	x \$ 2,577	= \$582,402	= 68.5
Associate	202	x 660	= 133,320	= 15.7
Assistant	288	x 466	= 134,208	= 15.8
Totals	716		\$849,930	100.0

Thus, the \$400,00 would be distributed as follows:

\$274,000 (68.5% of \$400,000) among the 226 full Professors,  
or approximately \$1,212 each.

\$62,800 (15.7% of \$400,000) among the 202 Associate Professors,  
or about \$311 each.

\$63,200 (15.8% of \$400,000) among the 288 Assistant Professors,  
or approximately \$219 each.

This would eliminate slightly less than half of the disparity resulting in the following comparison with and without the \$400,000 addition as specified above.

Rank	100 Institution Average	ISU Average w/out \$400,000	ISU Average with \$400,000
Professor	\$27,677	\$25,100	\$26,312
Associate	\$20,960	\$20,300	\$20,611
Assistant	\$16,966	\$16,500	\$16,719
Instructor	\$13,516	\$13,700	\$13,700

Again, this illustration is purely hypothetical since the \$400,000 was not distributed in 1978-79 or in any single year. It does, however, illustrate both the general impact of the proposed action and a method of distribution of funds to individuals.

#### Plan for Distribution of \$100,000 a Year for Four Years to Improve Faculty Salaries at Illinois State University

It is proposed that the following plan be adopted for distribution of \$100,000 each year for four years (1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84, and 1984-85) from funds available through reallocation from the transfer of utility costs from general revenue to bond revenue. The plan described would be used each year for the four years.

1. The number of Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors eligible for the distribution will be determined each year by the Office of the Provost. Those faculty eligible would include all full-time faculty members at the three specified ranks who are assigned to academic departments, including department chairpersons, who are expected to be at the University the following year (who have not resigned, retired, or who for whatever reason will not be employed at the University the following year). Faculty members on grant appointments or leaves would be treated as any other faculty members for this purpose.

2. The study (see Table 3) of average faculty salaries by rank at the 100 Category I public universities would be replicated by the Office of the Provost each year, using the most current AAUP salary survey data available.

3. Combining the information obtained in steps 1 and 2 above, a calculation will be made of the total deficiency by rank and rank percentage of that deficiency in the same manner as illustrated earlier in this paper (e.g., number of faculty in the rank x deficiency in the rank obtained from the replication of the study = total deficiency for the rank, with a subsequent calculation of the percentage deficiency of the total for this rank).



4. The funds would subsequently be distributed to individuals by calculating the amount of funds available for each rank (percentage deficiency of the total for the rank x \$100,000 and dividing that sum equally among each person in that rank identified in step 1 above). This calculation would be completed in the same manner described earlier in this paper.

5. This distribution of salary increase funds would be in addition to the amounts distributed through the usual annual ASPT procedures.

Unless there are major shifts in salary patterns at the 100 institutions used for the base comparison, implementation of this plan should have the effect of bringing average faculty salaries at the three professorial ranks at Illinois State University more into line with faculty salaries at the sampling of public universities in the United States offering doctoral degree programs, with the major effect on ISU salaries at the Professor level.

Table 1

COMPARISON OF 1978-79 AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES  
BY RANK AT CATEGORY I PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS  
WITH THOSE AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

<u>Academic Ranks</u>	<u>Category I** Public Universities</u>	<u>Illinois State University</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Professor	\$28,190	25,100	\$(3,090)
Associate	21,070	20,300	(770)
Assistant	17,090	16,500	(590)
Instructor	13,570	13,700	130

\*Data from "An Era of Continuing Decline: Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 1978-79," Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors (September, 1979), pp. 319-367. See particularly Table 13 on p. 334.

\*\* Category I institutions are defined by AAUP as "institutions which offer the doctoral degree and which conferred in the most recent three years an annual average of fifteen or more earned doctorates covering a minimum of three nonrelated disciplines." Illinois State University is a Category I AAUP institution.

Table 2

COMPARISON OF 1978-79 AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES  
BY RANK AT CATEGORY I ILLINOIS PUBLIC  
UNIVERSITIES WITH THOSE AT ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY\*

<u>Institution**</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate</u>	<u>Assistant</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
ISU	\$25,100	\$20,300	\$16,500	\$13,700
NIU	26,400	21,200	16,700	12,100
SIU-C	26,000	20,200	16,000	13,100
UI-CC	29,300	21,500	17,400	15,000
UI-UC	30,400	21,500	18,100	15,200
Average Ex- clusive of ISU	<u>\$28,025</u>	<u>\$21,100</u>	<u>\$17,050</u>	<u>\$13,850</u>
Difference	<u>\$(2,925)</u>	<u>\$ (800)</u>	<u>\$ (550)</u>	<u>\$ (150)</u>

\*Data from "Compensation in Illinois Institutions of Higher Education: Summary of Findings," Illinois Board of Higher Education (November 6, 1979). See particularly Table 8 on p. 29. This IBHE study report utilizes AAUP salary data.

\*\*Institutions are: ISU, Illinois State University; NIU, Northern Illinois University; SIU-C, Southern Illinois University-Carbondale; UI-CC, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle; UI-UC, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. These are the AAUP Category I Public Universities in Illinois.

Table 3

STUDY OF 1978-79 AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES  
 BY RANK AT 100 CATEGORY I  
 PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate</u>	<u>Assistant</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
1. U. of Alabana	\$26,600	\$20,600	\$16,000	\$12,300
2. Arizona State U.	28,900	22,100	17,900	14,600
3. Northern Arizona U.	27,400	22,700	18,400	14,400
4. U. of Arizona	29,700	22,100	17,800	14,900
5. U. of Arkansas	24,800	19,900	16,400	13,000
6. U. of Calif.-Berkeley	30,800	20,800	17,900	-
7. U. of Calif.-Davis	27,700	20,400	16,600	-
8. U. of Calif.-San Diego	29,700	20,500	16,700	-
9. Colorado State U.	25,500	20,200	16,800	13,000
10. U. of Colorado	26,200	20,000	16,600	15,1
11. U. of Northern Colorado	23,500	17,700	14,900	12,300
12. U. of Connecticut	32,200	22,800	18,000	15,300
13. U. of Delaware	31,400	22,200	17,100	14,200
14. Howard U.	30,000	21,900	18,000	14,000
15. Florida State U.	25,900	19,100	16,400	13,600
16. U. of Florida	26,400	20,000	17,700	14,800
17. U. of South Florida	25,200	19,700	15,700	13,800
18. Georgia State U.	28,000	21,000	17,500	13,800
19. U. of Georgia	28,400	21,100	17,200	12,700
20. U. of Hawaifi	29,400	21,100	17,100	13,700
21. Idaho State U.	23,100	19,400	15,400	13,700
22. U. of Idaho	24,400	19,100	15,900	-
23. Ill. State U.	25,100	20,300	16,500	13,700
24. Northern Ill. U.	26,400	21,200	16,700	12,100
25. So. Ill. U.-Carb.	26,000	20,200	16,000	13,100

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate</u>	<u>Assistant</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
26. U. of Ill.-Urbana	\$30,400	\$21,500	\$18,100	\$15,200
27. U. of Ill.-Circle	29,300	21,500	17,400	15,000
28. Ball State U.	25,200	19,900	15,900	11,200
29. Indiana State U.	23,900	19,500	16,100	13,100
30. Indiana U.	27,900	20,400	16,600	-
31. Purdue U.	30,200	21,500	17,300	12,500
32. Iowa State U.	27,100	20,700	16,700	12,300
33. U. of Iowa	28,700	21,700	17,400	14,600
34. Kansas State U.	26,100	20,600	16,700	13,400
35. U. of Kansas	27,300	20,500	16,600	13,800
36. U. of Kentucky	27,200	21,000	17,000	14,300
37. Louisiana State U.	26,500	20,300	16,900	13,000
38. U. of Maine	22,900	17,500	14,400	9,900
39. U. of Maryland	28,700	21,100	17,000	12,800
40. U. of Massachusetts	27,900	20,700	16,500	14,500
41. Michigan State U.	28,000	21,800	18,200	15,200
42. U. of Michigan	32,700	23,200	18,700	14,900
43. Wayne State U.	30,500	22,300	17,600	13,200
44. Western Michigan U.	25,900	19,900	16,400	12,500
45. U. of Minnesota	29,000	21,400	17,600	14,500
46. Miss. State U.	24,800	18,900	15,900	12,600
47. U. of Mississippi	25,600	20,800	16,100	11,300
48. U. of Missouri-Col.	26,500	20,900	17,400	14,500
49. U. of Missouri-Kansas City	26,600	21,100	17,600	12,500
50. U. of Missouri-St. Louis	29,100	21,400	17,100	12,100
51. Montana State U.	23,000	19,200	15,800	13,500
52. U. of Montana	21,900	17,200	15,100	13,300
53. U. of Nebraska	25,800	20,000	16,400	11,400

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate</u>	<u>Assistant</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
54. U. of Nevada	27,300	21,400	17,400	-
55. U. of New Hampshire	25,900	20,200	15,800	14,300
56. Rutgers U.-New Brunswick	35,700	25,200	17,600	13,500
57. Rutgers U.-Newark	35,900	25,600	18,600	15,000
58. New Mexico State U.	26,500	20,200	16,400	12,600
59. U. of New Mexico	27,300	20,200	16,500	13,300
60. SUNY-Albany	32,300	23,600	17,800	-
61. SUNY-Binghamton	31,800	23,700	17,200	14,500
62. SUNY-Buffalo	33,700	23,200	17,500	-
63. SUNY-Stoney Brook	33,200	23,600	16,600	15,300
64. No. Carolina State U.	28,200	215,00	17,100	13,300
65. U. of No. Carolina	31,400	22,400	18,800	13,900
66. No. Dakota State U.	23,200	20,100	16,200	12,400
67. U. of No. Dakota	23,600	19,200	15,900	12,400
68. Bowling Green State U.	27,200	21,100	16,900	13,500
69. Kent State U.	25,500	19,500	16,300	13,400
70. Miami U.-Ohio	27,400	21,000	16,800	14,500
71. Ohio State U.	29,900	22,600	18,500	15,100
72. Ohio U.	24,800	19,200	16,500	13,000
73. Oklahoma State U.	25,200	19,900	16,300	12,300
74. U. of Oklahoma	25,500	20,200	16,100	11,000
75. Oregon State U.	27,400	21,400	17,300	15,100
76. U. of Oregon	28,400	21,300	17,300	15,100
77. Penn. State U.	30,400	22,700	17,700	14,100
78. U. of Pennsylvania	33,300	23,500	19,300	15,300
79. U. of Pittsburgh	31,400	22,200	17,500	13,700
80. U. of Rhode Island	27,600	21,100	17,100	12,600
81. U. of So. Carolina	29,100	21,700	17,300	13,500

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate</u>	<u>Assistant</u>	<u>Instructor</u>
82. U. of So. Dakota	23,100	18,000	15,600	12,600
83. Middle Tenn. State U.	23,200	19,500	16,100	12,600
84. Memphis State U.	25,500	20,800	16,600	12,600
85. U. of Tennessee	26,700	20,600	16,700	12,500
86. No. Texas State U.	26,100	20,800	17,200	14,200
87. Texas A & M U.	28,100	21,600	17,700	13,000
88. U. of Houston	28,100	21,200	17,200	13,600
89. U. of Texas	29,300	21,000	17,100	13,200
90. U. of Utah	28,500	21,000	17,400	14,700
91. Utah State U.	25,700	20,700	17,300	13,900
92. U. of Vermont	24,600	19,100	16,100	-
93. U. of Virginia	33,200	23,100	16,900	12,800
94. Virginia Poly & State U.	30,800	23,300	17,900	13,300
95. U. of Washington	29,200	21,300	17,400	14,500
96. Wash. State U.	26,200	20,100	17,900	13,600
97. West Virginia U.	25,500	20,600	16,300	12,900
98. U. of Wisconsin	28,400	20,800	17,500	14,100
99. U. of Wisc.-Milwaukee	28,200	20,600	17,800	14,700
100. U. of Wyoming	26,700	21,800	17,900	14,800
Average	<u>\$27,677</u>	<u>\$20,960</u>	<u>\$16,966</u>	<u>\$13,516</u>
ISU	<u>\$25,100</u>	<u>\$20,300</u>	<u>\$16,500</u>	<u>\$13,700</u>
Difference	<u>\$(2,577)</u>	<u>\$ (660)</u>	<u>\$ (466)</u>	<u>\$ 184</u>

OBJECTIONS TO OPERATION BOOTSTRAP  
(Faculty Salary Distribution)

We believe that this proposal, its content as well as the procedures under which it was established, will cause great and unwarranted discontent among the faculty. In addition, the fact that the vote in both the URC and Academic Senate was generally along rank (full professors voting for the proposal and most others voting against the proposal) will do little to alleviate this discontent.

The proposal was given to the URC by Dr. Stan Rives in April, 1980. It was approved by that committee and then sent to the Academic Senate.

The main component of the proposal involves distribution of \$100,000 per year over the next four years. This distribution is independent of the salary increases determined by the DFSC process. The proposal recommends that the money be distributed in the following manner:

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Full Professor</u>	<u>Associate Professor</u>	<u>Assistant Professor</u>
Percentage Increase (over 4 years)	68.5%	15.7%	15.8%
Total Dollar Increase (over 4 years)	\$1,212	\$311	\$219

The proposal uses only one criterion for salary distribution, namely, average salary per rank comparisons with an arbitrary set of 100 public universities in Category I.

The objectives to the above proposal are many.

Procedural Objections

1. Except for Academic Senators, the proposal received no distribution to faculty or even department chairperson. Thus it was virtually impossible for Senators to hear the views of those faculty they represent.
2. The proposal was never an information item. Thus, along with the complaint cited in item one above, the document received less scrutiny than it generally would have under normal Senate procedures.
3. The plan has a 4 year time horizon while normal salary procedures are for 1 year.

Objections to the Proposal Itself

1. The sample of schools used is inappropriate.
  - a. As we have only recently become a category I school (most of which have long established Ph.D. programs) it should be expected that our full professors' salaries are lower than the average of these schools.
  - b. Comparative schools within the midwest region should be used and disciplines such as Law, Engineering and Medicine should be eliminated because they create a bias at the full professor level and to a lesser extent at the other ranks.

2. Median salaries should be used rather than average if this comparative criterion is to be used at all.
3. Uniqueness of departments is ignored
  - a. This proposal rewards those departments that have had relatively easy promotion policies in the past and encourages such policies in the future. It also rewards selected departments within the University that have an abundance of tenured full professors.
  - b. The proposal penalizes those departments that are young, new, or growing, and have very few full professors.  
These raises will become embedded in the department base and will penalize the above mentioned departments.
4. The proposal makes no adjustments based on salaries by disciplines (see table from the Chronicle of Higher Education, April 14, 1980).
5. The proposal does not discriminate between productive and non-productive faculty.
6. The proposal does nothing to encourage productive faculty to stay at Illinois State University.

We believe the URC should consider some alternative methods of salary distribution. We suggest the following possibilities, there are more to be sure:

1. A combination of across the board increases with some of the money, and productivity increases with the rest of the money, would be a good compromise.
2. A more representative sample of schools with median salaries could be used.
3. Dollar increases could partially be used to increase salaries of those faculty receiving dry promotions or completing doctorates without extra dollar compensation.
4. Each college could have its accrediting body provide a regional survey of salaries by rank for disciplines within the college. Then differences between medians could be used to allocate money relative to each rank and discipline. This would take time, but, in the end, this method would do more to retain those faculty who are most likely to leave because of large discrepancies between their ISU salary and what they could receive at a similar university.
5. Let each chairperson and dean recommend to the provost those faculty who are thought to be the most productive and underpaid or those most likely to leave but whom the university can't afford to lose or is unable to replace with someone of equal quality at the same salary.
6. If we really want a simple plan, why not just give everyone at all ranks the same amount and call it an inflation raise. This way no one has to make any difficult decisions.

This is a response from the faculty on the minority side of the vote and we have requested that this response be placed in the minutes of the Academic



Senate meeting of May 7, 1980.

Steve Friedberg, Mathematics  
Geoffrey Hirt, Finance & Law  
Len Schmaltz, Psychology  
Glenn Grever, English  
Larry Miller, Industrial Technology  
Fritz Schwalm, Biological Sciences  
Herb Koerselman, Music  
Iris Varner, Business Education and  
Administrative Services  
Julie Gowen, Philosophy